

The following applicant has applied for permits to conduct certain activities with endangered species. This notice is provided pursuant to section 10(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531, *et seq.*):

**Applicant:** Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services, Region 3, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota.  
Permit No. PRT-697830

The applicant requests an amendment to their current permit to take the following species for scientific purposes and the enhancement of propagation or survival in accordance with recovery outlines, recovery plans, listing, or other Service work for those species.

1. Clubshell (*Pleurobema clava*)
2. Cracking pearly mussel (*Hemistena (=Lastena) lata*)
3. Ring pink (=golf stick pearly) mussel (*Obovaria retusa*)
4. Purple cat's paw pearly mussel (*Epioblasma (=Dysnomia) obliquata obliquata (=E. sulcata sulcata)*)
5. Northern riffleshell (*Epioblasma torulosa rangiana*)
6. Hungerford's crawling water beetle (*Brychius hungerfordi*)
7. Hine's emerald dragonfly (*Somatochlora hineana*)

Documents and other information submitted with these applications are available to the public during normal business hours (7:30 a.m.—4 p.m.) in Room 650, Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Endangered Species, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111-4056.

Interested persons may comment on any of these applications within 30 days of the date of this publication by submitting written views, arguments, or data to the Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 3, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling, Minnesota 55111-4056. Please refer to PRT-697830 when submitting comments.

Dated: April 10, 1995.

**William F. Hartwig,**

*Regional Director, Region 3, Fish and Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, Minnesota.*

[FR Doc. 95-9339 Filed 4-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-M

#### **Record of Decision for a Final Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (SPEIS) on the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration and Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Programs**

**AGENCY:** Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Notice is hereby given that the Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has selected the No Change Alternative for its operation of the Sport Fish Restoration and Wildlife Restoration Programs into the next century. This decision was based on the Service analysis of the program contained in a SPEIS to augment the Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) published in 1978 and comments received from the public regarding that SPEIS.

**ADDRESSES:** Columbus H. Brown, Chief, Division of Federal Aid, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arlington Square Building, Room 140, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22203.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Columbus H. Brown, Chief, Division of Federal Aid, Telephone (703) 358-2156.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

The Federal Aid in Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program was initiated with the passage of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 *et seq.*) in 1937. This Act has been commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act in honor of the sponsors of the Act. The purpose of the Act was to provide a stable and secure source of funding to the States for the management, conservation, and enhancement of wildlife species. The Act was passed in response to dramatic declines in the populations of a number of game species and was originally intended as a mechanism to restore those populations to healthy levels. Funding for the Wildlife Restoration Program is derived from Federal excise taxes on sporting arms, ammunition, and certain archery equipment.

The Wildlife Restoration Act authorizes the Service to deduct a maximum of 8 percent of the funds for administration of the Act and for carrying out the Migratory Bird Conservation Act. After making administrative deductions, the remaining funds are apportioned to the States based on the geographic area, number of hunting license holders, and State population. Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands, receive a fixed percentage of the funds apportioned. Funds apportioned under the Wildlife Restoration Program for fiscal year 1994 came to a total of \$182,081,117.

While the Wildlife Restoration Act was specifically directed toward developing funds for wildlife management, it served as the pattern for a similar funding mechanism directed at

fisheries management. In 1950, the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777 *et seq.*), commonly called the Dingell-Johnson Act was passed. The legislation was further augmented by the Wallop-Breaux amendment of 1984, providing additional funds. The Sport Fish Restoration Program provides stable funding for restoration, conservation, management and enhancement of sport fish, and the provision of benefits from these resources to the public; improved boating access; and aquatic resource education. Funds provided by this Act are derived from Federal excise taxes on fishing tackle and related equipment, federal taxes on gasoline used in motorboats, duties on imported boats, and fishing tackle, and interest earned on investment of these funds.

Sport Fish Restoration Program funds are apportioned based on the number of fishing license holders and the geographic area of each State. Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the District of Columbia receive a fixed percentage of the funds apportioned. The Service may deduct up to 6 percent for administration of the Act. State funds apportioned under the Sport Fish Restoration program for fiscal year 1994 came to a total of \$174,628,718.

The mentioned Act form the basis of the Federal Aid in Sport Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program, or the Federal Aid Program (Program). The Program is administered by the Service's Division of Federal Aid (Division). The Division's mission is to strengthen the ability of State and Territorial fish and wildlife agencies to restore and manage fish and wildlife resources to meet effectively the consumptive and nonconsumptive needs of the public for fish and wildlife resources.

#### **Alternatives Considered**

Five alternatives, listed below, were considered in the SPEIS. Each alternative was developed by Service, State, and public inputs and focuses on the needs and direction of the Federal Aid Program into the next century. Under each of these alternatives, the basic core of Program activities would continue as it is at present with gradual changes in emphasis in response to public interest and need.

Alternative 1—No Change to the Existing Program Direction. Continue current administration and activities.

Alternative 2—Emphasis on National and Regional Priorities. Encourage States to consider funding projects contributing to national or regional

priorities that are cooperatively identified by the States and the Service in consultation with the public.

Alternative 3—Emphasis on Additional Funding for Biodiversity and Watchable Wildlife Projects. States will be provided an expanded funding base for use on biodiversity and watchable wildlife enhancement projects.

Alternative 4—Increase Administrative Flexibility of States. Increased responsiveness to State needs, such as administrative flexibility, aquatic education expansion, and adult education for wildlife programs.

Alternative 5—Eliminate Most Service Overview of States. Propose legislation and policy changes to eliminate most Service overview of State projects including project approval. States would be provided program rules, general guidance, and apportionment of funds. States would provide reports of accomplishments and would be periodically monitored by the Service.

#### Decision

Alternative 1, "No Change to the Existing Program Direction" was selected by the Service for future administration of the Program. This selection was made in response to overwhelming support of the existing program by respondents to the draft document issued in November 1993. The majority of comments received during the comment period expressed the opinions that the Program was working well and urged the Service not to make changes. Most persons commented that States are in the best position to assess the needs of citizens for fish and wildlife resources and that the Federal Government should not get more involved in establishing priorities for State projects. The Service is convinced that the existing Program is effectively meeting the needs of hunters, anglers, boaters, and other users of the nation's fish and wildlife resources and does not plan to change the way the Program is administered.

#### Significant Issues Raised

After the final SPEIS was distributed to the public in December 1994, several parties asked that the Service adopt a more flexible policy relating to projects to educate State employees. Currently, employees that are actively working on Federally funded projects may be trained using Program funds, but training of employees not working on active projects may not be funded. The Service intends to explore the need for this change with the States independently of this Record of Decision.

No other significant issues were raised during review of the Final SPEIS. Because the Final SPEIS adopted the preferred alternative suggested by most public comments, the few public comments on the final draft were supportive.

#### Copies Are Available

Copies of the Final SPEIS are available from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Federal Aid, Arlington Square Building, MS-140, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Arlington, Virginia, 22203, during normal working hours. Telephone (703) 358-2156.

Dated: March 22, 1995.

**Mollie H. Beattie,**

*Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.*

[FR Doc. 95-9414 Filed 4-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-M

#### National Park Service

##### Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission; Meeting

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces an upcoming meeting of the Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission. Notice of this meeting is required under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463).

**MEETING DATE AND TIME:** Wednesday, April 19, 1995; 1:30 p.m. until 4:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Aldie Mansion, 85 Old Dublin Pike, Doylestown, PA 18901.

The agenda for the meeting will focus on implementation of the Management Action Plan for the Delaware and Lehigh Canal National Heritage Corridor and State Heritage Park. The Commission was established to assist the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and its political subdivisions in planning and implementing an integrated strategy for protecting and promoting cultural, historic and natural resources. The Commission reports to the Secretary of the Interior and to Congress.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission was established by Public Law 100-692, November 18, 1988.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Acting Executive Director, Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission, 10 E. Church Street, Room P-208, Bethlehem, PA 18018, (610) 861-9345.

Dated: April 6, 1995.

**Donald M. Bernhard,**

*Chairman, Delaware and Lehigh Navigation Canal NHC Commission.*

[FR Doc. 95-9338 Filed 4-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

##### Antitrust Division

##### United States v. Motorola, Inc. and Nextel Communications, Inc.; Public Comments and Response on Proposed Final Judgment

Pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16(b)-(h), the United States publishes below the comments received on the proposed Final Judgment in *United States of America v. Motorola, Inc. and Nextel Communications, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 1:94CV02331, filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, together with the response of the United States to the comments.

Copies of the response and the public comments are available on request for inspection and copying in room 3233 of the Antitrust Division, United States Department of Justice, Tenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20530, and for inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, United States Courthouse, Third Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20001.

**Constance K. Robinson,**

*Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.*

##### Response to Public Comments to the Proposed Final Judgment

[Case No. 1:94CV02331]

Pursuant to the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. 16 (b)-(h) ("APPA"), the United States of America hereby files its Response to Public Comments to the proposed Final Judgment in this civil antitrust proceeding. The United States has reviewed the comments on the proposed Final Judgment and remains convinced that entry of the proposed Final Judgment is in the public interest.

##### I. Summary of Proceedings

This proceeding relates to the proposed consolidation of the trunked specialized mobile radio ("SMR") businesses of Nextel Communications, Inc. ("Nextel") and Motorola, Inc. ("Motorola"), the two largest providers of those services in the United States. This transaction is part of Nextel's